

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00378 01 OF 02 232131Z

66

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 AEC-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-01 INR-07 IO-10 L-02

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 BIB-01

USIE-00 ISO-00 INRE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 /082 W

----- 014414

O R 231810Z JAN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9721

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0378

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION JANUARY 23 OF EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL

REF: A) USNATO 273; B) STATE 12465; C) STATE 11498; D) USNATO 274

BEGIN SUMMARY: SPC ON JANUARY 23 CONSIDERED EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL. FRG INTRODUCED AS DRAFT GUIDANCE TO AHG AN AMENDED VERSION OF UK TEXT, INFORMING PACT OF UNACCEPTABILITY OF LATTER'S FREEZE PROPOSAL, AND RE-PROPSING EARLIER ALLIED NON-INCREASE OFFERS RELATED TO REDUCTIONS. CANADA INTRODUCED DRAFT GUIDANCE BASED ON DUTCH TEXT, WHICH WOULD INFORM PACT OF UNACCEPTABILITY OF EASTERN FREEZE, AND PROPOSE UNILATERAL FREEZE DECLARATION. ITALIAN AND DANISH REPS ON INSTRUCTIONS SUPPORTED UK APPROACH AND NORWEGIAN AND LUXEMBOURG REPS DID SON ON PERSONAL BASIS. UK REP AGREED TO WITHDRAW UK TEXT AND WORK WITH FRG SUBMISSION. NETHERLANDS REP WITHDREW DUTCH TEXT IN FAVOR OF CANADIAN TEXT WHILE RESERVING ON LAST

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00378 01 OF 02 232131Z

SENTENCE. SPC WILL NEST MEET JANUARY 27, WITH POSSIBLE NAC CONSIDERATION JANUARY 29. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON COMMENT ON FRG, CANADIAN AND BELGIAN PROPOSALS IN TIME FOR JANUARY 27 SPC MEETING. END SUMMARY

1. SPC ON JANUARY 23 CONSIDERED DEFINITIVE ALLIED REACTION TO THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL. ACTING CHAIRMAN (KILLHAM) STRESSED THE NEED FOR EARLY GUIDANCE TO THE AD HOC GROUP.

2. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES ALSO BELIEVED THE AHG NEEDS EARLY GUIDANCE, AND SAW A DANGER THAT THE OTHER SIDE MIGHT "SMELL DISAGREEMENT" AMONG THE ALLIES ON THIS SUBJECT. FRG REP STATED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES HAD NOW DECIDED TO SUPPORT THE UK DRAFT GUIDANCE (REF A), WITH MINOR AMENDMENTS. HE DISTRIBUTED A TEXT AS DRAFT GUIDANCE TO THE AHG (TRANSMITTED SEPTEL) WHICH, LIKE THE UK DRAFT GUIDANCE, BEGINS WITH THE U.S. LANGUAGE TELLING THE EAST THAT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL IS NOT ACCEPTABLE, AND THEN GOES ON TO PROPOSE AGAIN THE EXISTING ALLIED OFFERS OF NON-INCREASE COMMITMENTS. HE NOTED THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FRG AND UK TEXTS. THE FRG TEXT REFERS TO A "NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT" RATHER THAN A "FREEZE". THE FRG TEXT REFERS TO AN "UNDERSTANDING" ON A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT INSTEAD OF AN "AGREEMENT". THE FRG TEXT PROVIDES THAT THE FORCE LEVELS SUBJECT TO NON-INCREASE WOULD SUBSEQUENTLY BE LOWERED TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS IN PHASE I, INSTEAD OF THE UNSPECIFIED REDUCTIONS MENTIONED IN THE UK TEXT, IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN THE PRESENT ALLIED POSITION THAT ONLY GROUND FORCES ARE SUBJECT TO REDUCTION IN PHASE I.

3. FRG REP SAID THAT THE FRG DOES NOT LIKE THE BELGIAN AND DUTCH PROPOSALS (REF A) FOR UNILATERAL ALLIED DECLARATIONS OF A FREEZE IN VIEW OF THE DIFFICULTIES HE MENTIONED AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING (I.E. A UNILATERAL FREEZE WOULD TEND TO PERPETUATE DISPARITIES AND PREJUDICE THE NEGOTIATION AGAINST THE COMMON CEILING). FRG CONSIDERED THE US PAPER HELPFUL, PARTICULARLY THE PROPOSED LINE OF ARGUMENT FOR USE WITH PARLIAMENTARY AND PRESS OPINION, (REF B), WHICH THE ALLIES COULD USE WITH ONLY SLIGHT MODIFICATION IN DEFENSE OF THE UK POSITION, WITH THE FRG AMENDMENTS. FRG BELIEVED THAT THIS POSITION, IN PROPOSING AGAIN THE EARLIER ALLIED NON-INCREASE OFFERS, WOULD HELP MORE WITH PUBLIC OPINION THAN THE US PROPOSAL. A NON-  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00378 01 OF 02 232131Z

INCREASE COMMITMENT OF THIS SORT, BASED ON AGREEMENT ON DATA, WOULD HELP DETER THE SOVIETS FROM PROPAGANDA ATTACKS ON RESTRUCTURING OF ALLIED FORCES. THIS PROPOSAL CLEARLY CALLS FOR A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT RELATED TO REDUCTIONS. FRG DOES NOT SHARE US CONCERN THAT SOVIETS COULD, IN RESPONSE TO AN ALLIED PROPOSAL OF THIS SORT, COME BACK WITH MEANINGLESS COMPROMISE OFFERS THAT WOULD DRAW THE ALLIES INTO AN AGREEMENT ON EASTERN TERMS, SO LONG AS THE ALLIES REMAIN FIRM ON THEIR PROPOSAL.

4. CANADIAN REP (ROY) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED THE US POSITION ESSENTIALLY THE BEST, EXCEPT FOR THE PROBLEM OF EUROPEAN PUBLIC OPINION. THE UK PROPOSAL, WOULD NOT ASSURE PUBLIC OPINION THAT THE ALLIES HAD SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED THE EASTERN PROPOSAL,

SINCE THE UK DRAFT GUIDANCE MERELY FINDS THE EASTERN PROPOSAL UNACCEPTABLE AND RE-PROPOSES THE EARLIER ALLIED NON-INCREASE COMMITMENTS: I.E. THE UK DRAFT GUIDANCE PROPOSES NOTHING NEW. THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL OF A UNILATERAL ALLIED FREEZE WOULD INVOLVE THE ALLIES IN A NEGOTIATION WITH THE OTHER SIDE ON THE FORM OF EACH SIDE'S FREEZE AGREEMENT, AND THUS COULD INVOLVE THE ALLIES IN AN UNPRODUCTIVE NEGOTIATION ON THE IDEA OF A FREEZE. CANADIAN AUTHORITIES LIKE THE DUTCH PROPOSAL. (COMMENT: THE DUTCH PROPOSAL TOOK THE US DRAFT DUIDANCE ALMOST VERBATIM, WITH THE ADDITION OF A SENTENCE STATING THAT THE ALLIES HAD NO INTENTION TO INCREASE WHILE THE NEGOTIATIONS ARE GOING ON.) CANADA LIKED THE DUTCH APPROACH FOR A UNILATERAL FREEZE BECAUSE IT SET NO CONDITIONS FOR THE WEST, THERE WAS NO NEED TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE OTHER SIDE, AND IT WOULD DETER THE OTHER SIDE FROM MAKING ITS FREEZE PROPOSAL PUBLIC IF THE OTHER SIDE COULD NOT ACCEPT THE DUTCH PROPOSAL. CANADIAN REP THEN CIRCULATED DRAFT GUIDANCE SIMILAR IN MOST RESPECTS TO THE DUTCH DRAFT GUIDANCE, WITH THE PRINCIPAL CHANGE BEING THE ADDITION OF A SENTENCE AT THE END INVITING THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE A SIMILAR STATEMENT OF INTENTION.

5. BELGIAN (BURNY) BELIEVED THAT THE UK, FRG, AND DUTCH, PROPOSALS WOULD ALL ENGAGE THE ALLIES IN A NEGOTIATION OF A FREEZE, AND DIVERT THE NEGOTIATION FROM ITS MAIN BUSINESS. THE US PROPOSAL WOULD NOT SATISFY EUROPEAN PUBLIC OPINION. THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL WOULD NOT LEAD TO A NEGOTIATION OF A FREEZE SINCE THE ALLIES WOULD SIMPLY MAKE THE DECLARATION CALLED FOR BY THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL ON A "THIS IT IT" BASIS. THE BELGIAN

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 00378 01 OF 02 232131Z

PROPOSAL LEFT THE OTHER SIDE NO OPENING WHATEVER TO ENGAGE THE ALLIES IN A TIME CONSUMING NEGOTIATION OF A FREEZE.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 00378 02 OF 02 232227Z

66

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-01 INR-07 IO-10

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 BIB-01

USIE-00 INRE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 /082 W

----- 015193

O R 231810Z JAN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9722

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE  
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0378

6. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES COULD PROBABLY GO ALONG WITH THE CHANGES IN THE DUTCH DRAFT GUIDANCE PROPOSED BY CANADA, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE LAST SENTENCE, I.E. THE INVITATION TO THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVE TO MAKE A SIMILAR UNILATERAL DECLARATION, SINCE THIS COULD AFFORD THE EAST AN OPENING TO ENGAGE THE ALLIES, IN EFFECT, IN THE NEGOTIATION OF A FREEZE.

7. US REP (MOORE) NOTED THE GENERAL CONSENSUS ON THE NEED TO AVOID GETTING INVOLVED IN A NEGOTIATION OF A FREEZE UNRELATED TO REDUCTIONS. HE SAID THATTHE PROPOSAL WHICH BEET AVOIDS THIS RISK IS THE US PROPOSAL, WHICH SIMPLY TELLS THE OTHER SIDE THAT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL IS UNACCEPTABLE, SUPPORTS A FREEZE RELATED TO REDUCTIONS, AND REMINDS THE OTHER SIDE OF THE EARLIER ALLIED OFFERS OF NON-INCREASE COMMITMENTS. HE STRESSED THAT THE ALLIES COULD PRESENT THIS APPROACH EFFECTIVELY TO THEIR PUBLIC OPINION IF THEEASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL BECAMEPUBLIC. HE QUESTIONED WHY THE FRG AND UK APPROACHES WOULD HELP ANY MORE THAN THE US PROPOSAL

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00378 02 OF 02 232227Z

WITH PUBLIC OPINION, SINCE THE FRG AND UK PROPOSALS DID NOT ADD MUCH TO EARLIER ALLIED NON-INCREASE OFFERS, BUT IN EFFECT RE-PROPOSED THEM. HE POINTED OUT THAT THIS LATTER FEATURE OF THE FRG AND UK PROPOSALS COULD GIVE THE OTHER SIDE AN OPENING TO MAKE SEEINGCOMPROMISES TO PUT PRESSURE ON THE ALLIES TO ACCEPT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL. HE NOTED THE CRITICISM OF THE BELGIAN AND DUTCH PROPOSALS WHICH SOME DELEGATIONS HAD MADE AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING(REF D).

8. ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI) SAID ITALY LIKED THE US APPROACH BEST, BUT PREFERRED THE UK APPROACH FORPUBLIC OPINION REASONS. HIS AUTHORITIES OPPOSED A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT NOT RELATED TO FIRST PHASE REDUCTIONS.

9. UK REP (LOGAN) OPPOSED THE PROPOSALS FOR UNILATERAL ALLIED DECLARATION OF A FREEZE ON GROUNDS THAT THESEPROPOSALS INCLUDED NO ELEMENTS OF THE ALLIED POSITION, HE ADDED THAT ALL OF THE UNILATERAL DECLARATION PROPOSALS RISKED ENGAGING THE ALLIES IN A NEGOTIATION OF A FREEZE UNRELATED TO REDUCTIONS; E.G., THE OTHER SIDE COULD REPLY TO SUCH PROPOSALS BY PROPOSING A UNILATERAL DECLARATION BY EACH DIRECT PARTICIPANT. HE SAID THAT THE ONLY ISSUE BETWEEN THE US APPROACH ON THE ONE HAND, AND THE UK AND FRG APPROACHES ON THE OTHER HAND, IS THAT THE UK AND FRG

WOULD REJECT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL IN A SOMEWHATMORE POSITIVE MANNER FOR PUBLIC OPINION REASOSN. HE BELIEVED THAT THE ALLIES COULD REJECT ANY MEANINGLEES COMPROMISES PROPOSED BY THE EAST IN RESPONSETOTHE UK OR FRG PROPOSAL, AND THAT PUBLIC OPINION WOULD UNDERSTAND THIS.

10. DANISH REP (VILLADSEN) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES SUPPORT THE UK APPROACH, AND THAT THEY WANT A FREEZE ONLY IN CONNECTION WITH REDUCTIONS.

11. LUXEMBOURG REP (HOSTERT) SAID THAT ON A PERSONAL BASIS, HE SUPPORTED THE UK/FRG APPROACH, AND HE CONSIDERED THAT THE PROPOSALS FOR UNILATERAL DECLARATIONS WOULD PERPETUATE THE DISPARITIES AND PREJUDICE THE NEGOTIATION AGAINST THE COMMON CEILING.

12. NORWEGIAN REP (SELMER) ALSO SUPPORTED THE UK APPROACH ON A PERSONAL BASIS.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00378 02 OF 02 232227Z

13. US REP NOTED THAT THE AD HOC GROUP NEEDS GUIDANCE ON THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL VERY SOON, AND SAID THAT THE US MISSION BELIEVES THE SPC SHOULD START THINKING ABOUT WHEN THIS MATTER SHOULD GO TO THE COUNCIL. UK REP THOUGHT THAT THE SPC SHOULD TRY TO MAKE AS MUCH PROGRESS AS POSSIBLE AT ITS MEETING ON MONDAY, JANUARY 27, AND THAT THE MATTER SHOULD THEN GO ON THE AGENDA FOR THE NAC MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29. NETHERLANDS AND FRG REPS AGREED. US REP SAIDTHAT THIS WAS A GOOD IDEA, AND MEMBER COUNTRIES COULD STATE AT JANUARY 27 SPC MEETING IF JANUARY 29 WERE A SUITABLE TIME FOR NAC CONSIDERATION. HOWEVER, BELGIAN REP SAID HE DID NOT BELIEVE SPC WOULD MAKE SUFFICIENT PROGRESS ON JANUARY 27 FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER THE MATTER ON JANUARY 29. HE NOTED THAT NAC HAS OCCASIONALLY MET ON FRIDAY ON MAJOR MBFR MATTERS, AND SUGGESTED THAT ALLIES CONSIDER AIMING FOR A NAC

MEETING ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 31. THIS WOULD PERMIT TWO MORE SPC MEETINGS PRIOR TO THAT NAC MEETING, AND WOULD GIVE THE ALLIES THE OPPORTUNITY TO AGREE ON NAC GUIDANCEIN TIME FOR THE FIRST NEGOTIATING SESSEION IN VIENNA. ACTING CHAIRMAN SAID THE SPC COULD CONSIDER THE DATE FOR NAC CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT GUIDANCE AT THE NEXT SPC MEETING JANUARY 27.

14. AT THE END OF THEMEETING, UK REP SAIDHE WAS WILLING TO DROP THE UK TEXT, AND WORK WITH THE FRG TEXT INSTEAD. NETHERLANDS REP SAID HE WAS WILLING TO DROP THE NETHERLANDS TEXT, AND WORK WITH THE CANADIAN TEXT INSTEAD, EXCEPT FOR THE LAST CANADIAN SENTENCEON INVITING THE OTHER SIDE TOMAKE A SIMILAR UNILATERAL DECLARATION. THUS THE ONLY TEXTS STILL UNDER CONSIDERATION IN SPC ARE THE US, FRG, CANADIAN, AND BELGIAN TEXTS.

15. COMMENT: NETHERLANDS' MISSION OFFICER TOLD US PRIOR TO THE MEETING THAT THE NETHERLANDS HAD ONLY INTRODUCED ITS TEXT TO BE

HELPFUL, WAS NOT NECESSARILY WEDED TO THE IDEA OF A UNILATERAL DECLARATION, AND WAS PREPARED TO MOVE TOWARD THE UK TEXT. APPARENTLY CANADIAN AGREEMENT WITH THE BASIC IDEA OF THE NETHERLANDS APPROACH LED THE NETHERLANDS REP INSTEAD TO MOVE TOWARD THE CANADIAN TEXT. IN VIEW OF REMARK OF NETHERLANDS MISSION OFFICER, DUTCH SUPPORT FOR CANADIAN TEXT WOULD NOT APPEAR FIRM.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 00378 02 OF 02 232227Z

16. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON GUIDANCE ON FRG, CANADIAN, AND BELGIAN TEXTS IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING MONDAY, JANUARY 27.  
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 23 JAN 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO00378  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750188/abbrzhr.tel  
**Line Count:** 288  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 6  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A) USNATO 273; B) STATE 12465; C) STATE 11498; D) USNATO 274  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 31 MAR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <31 MAR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <02 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION JANUARY 23 OF EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO BONN  
LONDON  
MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006